DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 140 937 PS 009 300

AUTHOR Falender, Carol A.; And Others
TITLE Simulation of an Infant Daycare Setting: Implementation and Evaluation.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Los Angeles. School of Education.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Mental Health (DHEW), Rockville, Md.
PUB DATE 76
GRANT USPHS-5-T01-MH-12924
NOTE 43p.; Report No. 3; For related documents, see PS 009 298-299

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; *Day Care Services; Early Childhood Education; Infants; *Inservice Programs; Role Playing; *Simulation; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Workshops
IDENTIFIERS Staff Training

ABSTRACT

This paper describes the development of a simulation technique that can be used in the training of infant day care administrators and personnel. The planning of the simulation was designed as a training experience for graduate students in an early childhood education program. Students, faculty members and child care professionals from the community were asked to role play the parts of director, teacher, parent, aide, community representative and junior college representative. Participants were divided into small groups and given envelopes of "in-box" materials, letters and memos on specific situations and problems typically confronting day care personnel each week. In the first phase of the simulation, all participants assumed the role of the director. In the second stage the scene shifted to a staff meeting for which different roles were assigned. The third phase was an advisory board meeting. Participants attempted to organize materials in terms of priority within each phase of the simulation and solve the most important problems. Summaries of small group discussions and consensus on topics were recorded. These records were used in an evaluation of the session, as were summary evaluations by individual participants and evaluation forms filled out at the end of group simulations. The evaluation procedure is discussed in detail, and recommendations for potential use of the simulation are made. Appendices include the background information presented to participants: a description of the simulated center, in-box materials, and the evaluation form used by participants. (SB)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED140937

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SIMULATION OF AN INFANT DAYCARE SETTING: IMPLEMENTATION AND EVALUATION*

Carol A. Falender
Maryalice Jordan-Marsh
Robert Murar

with

Mindy Campbell
Arline Dillman
Esther Fine
Janet Wertheimer

Early Childhood Development
Department of Education
University of California, Los Angeles

Report No. 3, 1976

PS009300

*This simulation was supported by Grant USPHS-5-T01-MH-12924

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
OVERVIEW	2
BACKGROUND	2
Administration in daycare programs Simulation in education	
PURPOSE OF THE SIMULATION	4
ORGANIZATION AND DEVELOPMENT	5
Issues Ground rules Stages in development	
THE SIMULATION IN OPERATION	9
EVALUATION	11
Summary evaluation forms Reporters and observations Ecological observations	
RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS	17
APPENDICES	23
A. Background materials for the simulation B. In-box materials C. Infant simulation evaluation	

Introduction

As the numbers of children in center-based daycare has been increasing, the number of persons involved in early childhood education, as practitioners or academicians, has also increased. A major problem has been providing training procedures, such as workshops, to bring persons in the field together. Another difficulty has been the failure to train any personnel for the decision-making positions they will be called upon to fill. The present report describes a procedure in which parents, students, early childhood practitioners, researchers, and academicians, as well as other interested people can be brought together to actively grapple with issues in a realistic problem-solving format, the simulation of an infant daycare setting.

Overview

This report describes the development of a simulation technique, adapted from methods having wide application in industry and in higher education, for uses related to infant daycare settings. In this simulation we have created, through written and other materials, a particular setting requiring participants to role play the parts of persons involved in such a site (i.e., teachers, parents, administrators). Participants are thus introduced to the most salient issues and called on to adopt different perspectives in making administrative decisions.

This report will describe the background and organization of the simulation process, the simulation itself, the evaluation, and recommendations concerning the use of simulation for training in the field of early childhood development.

Background

Administrative problem solving in daycare programs

There has been little systematic study of administrative decision-making procedures as they pertain to daycare programs. Perhaps, this is because administrative practices have characteristically not evolved out of the needs of daycare centers, but rather have been adapted from other organizational structures. The Office of Child Development (Cohen, 1974) has proposed some guidelines for the formation of daycare administrative practice. These guidelines, which provided the structure for our simulation, will be reviewed in this section.

In the typical daycare setting, the broad division of administrative tasks is between the board of directors and the program director. The board of directors, or advisory board, usually consisting of ten to 20 members is legally responsible for the actions of the organization. Generally this body is composed of community representatives, parents, funding agents, and professional specialists in child development.

The board of directors performs at least four basic functions: (1) outlining the goals for the program, (2) evaluating performance, (3) establishing a link between the community and the daycare center, and (4) hiring the program director to whom it delegates administrative authority.

The director is responsible for the day-to-day functioning of the daycare program and serves as the liaison between the Board, the staff, the children, and the parents. The director has the responsibility of recruiting new staff, organizing programs for staff development, record keeping on the children, organizing and supervising parent involvement, maintaining good community relations, circulating publicity, and evaluating the program.

This administrative framework is an adaptation of the structure and function of business and traditional school organizational systems. However, little attention has been given to the unique processes of policy formation in daycare, and more importantly, it is a rare training program which exposes potential daycare administrators to any sort of preparation for the diverse roles they will later be called upon to assume. Thus, daycare directors and teachers find themselves faced with a wide range of problems for which they have had little or no training and in which they have little expertise.

Simulation in Education

Although simulation has been used in administrative studies in schools of education, it has been geared directly toward communicating the process of decision making, and often content issues have been distinctly secondary in importance. Cruickshank (1961) defined simulation as the creation of specific models to be operated by participants to provide them with problem-solving experiences. Decisions are made on the basis of previous training and available information. Content is not part of this definition. Similarly, in educational research, simulation has been used to study the process and outcome of administrative behavior per se, not the issues (Cunningham, 1971)

Infant daycare is a very new field. There is still great controversy over the desirability of group care for infants. Nonetheless, many agencies are undertaking or planning for infant daycare programs. Decisions about the conduct of these programs need to be made with full cognizance of the issues involved. The content of decisions in infant daycare requires careful emphasis. Therefore, this simulation was developed to acquaint participants with the types of issues and concerns pertinent to infant daycare (i.e., the content issues) and to provide insights into perspectives on the decision-making processes involved.

Purpose of the Simulation

The major purpose of this simulation was twofold. First, the planning of the simulation was an educational, training experience for the graduate students in the Early Childhood Development Specialization. Second, the simulation itself was to serve as a model of a training

procedure in which active participation was required and differing perspectives in problem-solving were illuminated. That is, instead of simply discussing infant daycare, participants were called upon to actively negotiate within such a setting.

An auxiliary purpose was to bring together individuals with different backgrounds and orientations (i.e., students, practitioners, academicians).

An additional goal was to develop a multifaceted evaluation procedure which would approach the simulation context from qualitative and ecological perspectives with application to other training efforts.

Organization and Development of the Simulation

The daycare simulation was organized by a faculty member and a group of students in the Early Childhood Development graduate program at the University of California, Los Angeles. At the first planning meeting, interested students developed a list of major issues in early child development and education deemed of critical importance in infant daycare. The directors of two early childhood infant centers provided ideas for the issues. Students were then assigned to develop a description of a fictional infant daycare setting (see Appendix 1), to write simulation ground rules that would provide an organizational framework, and to develop in-box materials for the chosen issues.

The in-box procedure was chosen because it provided flexibility in presenting issues, in examining roles, and in varying settings. By "in-box," we are referring to the memos and letters which are likely to appear on the desk of the director of an infant daycare center at the beginning of a busy week. Participants could be given the opportunity

to assume first, the role of director and then, of teacher, aide, parent, community representative, or governing body representative.

Issues. The issues chosen to serve as the core for the development of the in-box were (1) attachment-separation, and parent-infant, caretaker-infant interaction; (2) curriculum; (3) teacher training; (4) health services; (5) multicultural concerns; and (6) expansion alternatives including satellite homes and a family daycare network. All of these issues were derived from the input from practitioners and program seminars.

An example of an in-box item developed to highlight attachment and separation issues, is a telephone memo from a mother concerned that her child cries when the mother drops her off at the center, and cries when the mother takes her home in the late afternoon. A second example is a teacher memo concerning whether a mother should be allowed to breast feed at the center. Additional examples of in-box materials for each topic are given in Appendix 2.

Ground rules. The following rules were developed for the simulation.

1. During the initial time period, take notes on your position concerning memos, letters, and telephone messages which are in your envelopes.
2. The roles and positions assumed during the simulation should be maintained throughout the segment. In other words, it is essential to maintain a consistent position. It is understood that the positions expressed are not necessarily your own.
3. It is important to respond in terms of your role, and to encourage dialogue or discussion with participants who are assuming the same role or assuming other roles.

4. You will be asked to assume several roles one at a time during the simulation. The roles are:

   - Director
   - Teacher
   - Parent
   - Aide (community person, junior college student)
   - Community representatives
   - Junior college representatives

Remember this is a simulation of a practical situation with specific problems and issues. Try to address yourself to these in as direct and clear way as you can.

Organizational structure. Each group was to be composed of a facilitator, a recorder, and eight to ten participants. The role of the facilitator was (1) explaining the purpose, goals, and background of the simulation to the group; (2) aiding the participants in assigning priorities to the many possible topics for discussion; (3) assigning roles to participants and changing role assignments in the course of the simulation (this would mean that, for example, a person who had just role played a director would suddenly be cast in the role of a parent); (4) presenting opposing viewpoints to stimulate discussion; (5) deciding when to shift to a different form or phase of the simulation; (6) maintaining an open atmosphere in which participants felt comfortable speaking; (7) eliciting feedback from the group about their experience in the simulation through discussion and reporting on evaluation forms; (7) summarizing the group's discussion at the final meeting.

The role of the recorder was (1) keeping a record of the topics and positions expressed, (2) assisting the facilitator and providing feedback

as problems arose either in abiding by the ground rules of the simulation or clarifying points made by participants (i.e., perhaps saying, "it sounds as if the director and teacher are actually asking for the same thing, more parent involvement"), (3) reviewing essential content and process points at the conclusion of each phase of the simulation, and (4) summarizing with the facilitator.

Tags with first names only were distributed to all participants. It was intended that no introductions would be made until after the simulation, so that status and experience distinctions would not be evident from titles but might evolve in terms of individual contributions. Each of the participants was assigned a role to play in the initial segment and were asked to volunteer for additional roles later in the simulation.

Stages in the development of the simulation. Following the initial planning work, individual committee members presented the materials they had developed to the planning group for review and revision. These sample materials included memos to teachers and staff, telephone messages, letters to the director, letters to be sent home to parents, and inventories of equipment available at the center. At subsequent meetings, the committee itself staged rehearsals of the simulation to determine the value of the individual in-box contents for stimulating discussion. The trial experiences were the basis for selecting or eliminating a number of materials to be used in the actual simulation.

The goal of the rehearsals was also to standardize procedures and train the group facilitators and recorders. At the final meeting, discussion focused on group dynamics and methods to encourage or discourage interaction. It was emphasized that the role of facilitator and recorder

would be to encourage all members to participate and to prevent one person or several persons from dominating the discussion.

The Simulation in Operation

Approximately 45 graduate students in education and psychology, faculty members from a number of departments across campus, and professionals involved in child care from the community attended the simulation. The simulation took place for two hours in the afternoon. Four groups were set up, balanced according to sex and participating groups. Two groups were specifically designated to focus on multicultural issues.

As participants arrived they were given envelopes which contained their group assignments, the setting description and three packets of in-box materials, one for each phase of the simulation. Participants were then welcomed and a oriented to the simulation goals and procedures. It was explained that the sets of materials and this application of the simulation process had not been implemented previously. The in-box procedure was described: participants had been given background materials, memos, and letters which could be on the desk of a busy daycare administrator. It would be up to participants to organize the materials within each phase of the simulation and to solve the most important problems. Finally, the three phases of the simulation (meetings of first all directors, then staff, and finally the advisory board) were described. Participants were then directed to go to their small groups, according to assignments on their envelopes.

In the first part of the simulation, all participants assumed the role of director. Participants were given time to read the daycare

center description (see Appendix A.I), the roster of children (see Appendix A.II), and one packet of in-box contents (memos and letters) which had been distributed to each person. They were instructed to note their responses as director to individual items and to order the group of materials in terms of priority for the director's attention. At this point, discussion centered on similarities and differences among directors concerning priorities or responses to individual items.

In the second stage of the simulation, which began about 30 minutes later, at the direction of the facilitator, the setting shifted to a staff meeting. Roles of teacher, aide, director, and parent were assigned to participants. These roles were shifted as this phase progressed. Items which had been tabled in part one, and the second packet of materials were introduced at the staff meeing according to an agenda (see Appendix A.III).

The third stage was the advisory board meeting. This part of the simulation began at the discretion of the facilitator, after about 40 minutes of staff meeting. Issues from the first two stages which were deemed appropriate and the contents of a third packet of materials were reviewed by the participants in their new roles. Governing board and community representative roles were added to the existing roles at this point.

At the end of the time allotted for the small group simulations, the recorder summarized the discussions and the consensus on topics discussed. Participants then completed written evaluation forms (See Appendix C). Then, participants from all groups convened for a group discussion. At this time, recorders presented their group summary reports, and a debriefing occurred, focusing on the effectiveness of the

simulation procedure and suggestions, criticisms, or comments of participants. Refreshments and informal discussions followed.

Evaluation

The development of an evaluation procedure by students had been designated as a major purpose of the simulation. There were three major parts of the evaluation of the simulation: a participant summary, recorder's reports and ecological observations. In the first, the participant summary, evaluation forms were distributed to all participants at the end of the small group simulations. These forms focused upon background information about participants, expectations of participants, comfort in participation, and value of simulation in education (see Appendix C for the complete form). The format was adapted from Takanishi, Chaille, Garduque, Lovaas, and Pletcher (1974). The second part of the evaluation was drawn from recorder's reports, the summaries of small groups. The third part of the evaluation was completed by a "roving evaluator" who spent some time in each group to gatner more qualitative and ecological observations. Each part of the evaluation will be summarized in the following sections.

Part one: Summary evaluation forms

Participant information. Of the 45 participants, 42 completed evaluation forms. Twenty-eight participants were students; five were staff members from community facilities, five were faculty members, and four others were school administrators, a postdoctoral candidate, and a high school student. Ten participants had had direct contact with an

infant facility or center; 32 had not. Twelve participants were male; 30 were female.

Expectations for the simulation. Of the participants, two expected to come and listen to a large group lecture; 14 expected to participate in a highly formalized, highly structured small group situation; 17 expected to participate in a very open-ended, unstructured small group situation; seven had no idea what the situation would be or thought they would observe others.

Nineteen felt the simulation fulfilled their expectations; 14 felt it fulfilled their expectations to some extent; five felt it did not; four did not answer.

Interest in the simulation. When asked which part of the simulation they were most interested in (all directors, staff meeting, or advisory board), the greatest number (20) chose the staff meeting as first choice. This was followed by preference for the directors section; with the advisory meeting the least favored as first choice, and most favored as second choice. Four persons responded that all the sections were of equal interest to them.

Description of groups. In response to how participants would describe their small simulation groups, 28 felt comfortable in the group; 32 felt everyone was actively involved; one felt only a few people participated; and three (graduate students) felt hesitant about entering the discussion.

Nineteen participants felt they had a chance to raise all the issues and concerns they had in their small groups; 23 did not feel they had the chance.

Value of simulation and suggestions. Thirty-one participants felt that this type of simulation would be valuable to other students, parents, and people involved in child care; nine were uncertain. There were no respondents who indicated that the simulation would not be useful to others.

Approximately half the participants made comments in the space provided for suggestions of changes in format, topics, or organization. The consensus among those who responded was that there should be fewer memos and letters, and more time allotted for role play--at least three or four hours. Others suggested there be fewer role changes so that one person would maintain the same role all afternoon. Four others said they felt there was no need to change anything; it was "very good as it was."

Part two: Reporters' observations

Reporters from three of the four groups reported participants found it easy to adopt roles and express opinions not necessarily their own. Although there was some initial awkwardness noted, there was almost no resistance and once started, everyone seemed to enjoy role playing.

The differing styles of the groups were evident from the reporters' summaries. One group facilitator had begun by telling participants there was no reason they couldn't have fun. Throughout that group's report, a more fluent style and less cumbersome attitude were reflected. In contrast, two other groups became enmeshed in describing administrative roles.

Three groups reported that the participants were beginning to get very involved in roles during the last segment, the advisory board

meeting. These reporters expressed a preference for a longer simulation period--maybe three hours instead of an hour and a half. The fourth group, however, reported participants were tired by the last segment. This group seemed to have adopted an approach of dealing with almost all the individual memos briefly.

Across groups, the memos which were the most interesting and controversial were those concerning expansion alternatives for the center, a letter to parents concerning adopting a sensorimotor curriculum, a letter from a community member suggesting the staff be modified to reflect the ethnic composition of the community, a letter from a company offering a bottle prop for cribs, and a request from a university group for permission to do research on mother-child interaction at the center.

Part three: Ecological observations

This section of the evaluation discusses environmental qualities and dimensions and individual styles within the simulation task as well as the organization of groups and behaviors.

Physical environment and materials. Three classrooms and a large office were the settings in which workshop participants simulated the Sunnyside Infant Day Care Center. Two physical arrangements were available. In one room the chairs were positioned around a circular table in a typical group meeting fashion. In the other rooms the tables were placed on the periphery of the room with chairs arranged in a large oval around the center of the room. Each room was set up to accomodate twelve participants.

The only materials brought to these rooms by participants were three manila envelopes containing project agendas. As no other materials

were constructed or displayed to create the infant center's environment, these materials made up the essential simulation environment. The purposes of the materials were to (1) provide information characteristic of the decision making environment of the center, (2) facilitate interaction among participants to increase their appreciation of different roles and points of view, and (3) intensify and condense certain learning experiences to effectively understand the problems, issues and operation of an infant center program.

In terms of the preceding discussion three dimensions are presented as characterizing the general ecology of interactions within this environment. The dimensions are: interpersonal interactions, program agenda transitions, and setting specific behaviors.

Interpersonal interactions. Interactions observed among workshop participants varied between the two different physical arrangements. In the room with the chairs arranged around a table, behaviors of participants typified those of a group meeting more noticeably than in the rooms with the oval chair arrangement. For example, participants in the "chairs around the table" group were generally more spontaneous in their exchanges, thereby limiting the moderator's role as discussion facilitator. In addition, a consensus on particular items was generally arrived at more quickly, and there was greater effort made to respond to all the items presented in the various envelopes. Finally, eye contacts with the speaker were more frequent, maintained for longer periods of time, and were initiated by a greater number of participants. It appeared to the observer that the table helped to focus exchanges by providing a surface on which to spread the paperwork and by creating a purposeful, meeting atmosphere.

In contrast, participants seated in the rooms with the oval arrangement of chairs were observed to be frequently looking down at the papers in their lap or within their hands, making body adjustments, or looking at other members in the group (more often than looking at the speaker). Handling of papers was more common (i.e. sorting, rereading, aligning edges, underlining, etc.) here, than in the group with a table on which to rest their arms, elbows, and paperwork. Interestingly, in the oval arrangement, fewer topics were covered, but they were discussed in much greater depth.

Gesturing behaviors occurred with greatest frequency in the rooms with the oval chair arrangement. It seems that these differences occurred in the absence of a table which may have obstructed visual range as well as postural and other nonverbal expressions. The greater diameter of the seating arrangement may have given individuals a greater sense of space and distance and thereby potential for movement. In other words, individuals in this more open setting may have felt the situation was more informal and as a result were more free in their styles of expressing themselves.

In a review of the specific nature of group discussions, the major difference can be described in terms of rhythm. The work "rhythm" refers to the pace of the conversation or discussion as measured subjectively, and accordingly labeled staccato (clipped or fast tempo) and legato (slow paced).

For participants in the room with chairs around a table, the rhythm of discussion was generally staccato, where a fast inquiry and task resolution pattern occurred. The table seemed to enforce a task orientation for two reasons: (1) the participants were visually reminded of

their task by the paperwork on the table, and (2) the diameter of conversation space was compressed (from twelve to seven feet at the table--as compared to the oval chair setting) thereby through proximity individuals were more immersed in the rapid, task-oriented exchange.

In other rooms, the rhythm of discussion vacillated between being relaxed and reflective, to intense issue-probing. One explanation for this pattern is that an open space does not as readily provide pressure for orientation to the task. In these groups, moderators had the major responsibility for establishing the group's pace.

For the purpose of this type of simulation, it was concluded that the oval arrangement with no table facilitated the specific purposes set out. Although such an arrangement may not support progress toward task completion for an actual daycare center, it proved effective in facilitating more intense issue probing. In other words, the purposes of the simulation were different from those of an actual daycare staff meeting which would probably be most effectively conducted with chairs around a table.

In general, the qualitative analysis points out substantial behavior differences as a function of at least, in part, the spatial arrangement of the rooms. This analysis suggested that the working papers be reduced in quantity, with greater amounts of more focused information in fewer items.

Recommendations and Suggestions for Future Uses

In considering the potential uses of the simulation there are two major issues to discuss. The first relates to improvements that might

be considered for materials and procedures. The second refers to the applicability and usefulness of the infant daycare simulation experience for other audiences.

Improvements of materials and procedures. In terms of improving the "package" the clear preference of participants was to reduce the number of materials in the packets. Additional materials recommended include an organizational chart and a discussion of the center's philosophy and goals.

In terms of procedures it was suggested that a field visit to an infant care center be incorporated as a prerequisite for participants who are unfamiliar with such settings. In addition, those inexperienced in the technique of role playing might find it more meaningful to assume fewer roles during the simulation. Also, role changes and setting transitions might be more deliberately facilitated for groups inexperienced in role play and/or unfamiliar with existing infant care programs.

Facilitating role and setting transitions. One of the major questions raised concerning the success of the simulation project regards the learning outcome as derived from each of the different role assignments, i.e. director, teacher, parent, aide, community representative and so on. In large part, the experiences derived from these roles seem contingent on the degree to which participants "believed" the simulation on the whole: the infant center, and in part, the different group meeting and roles. Without environmental props, the establishment of a "situational or role ecology" depended on the convincing quality of the moderator's introductory remarks in presenting the first agenda (i.e. director's meeting) and the subsequent transitions (i.e. staff meeting and advisory meeting).

Through close observation, it was observed in every group that no dramatic visual or physical transition was made to distinguish a new ecology of purpose (the assumption of a different institutional structure, i.e. director, staff, advisory member). The transitions were verbally made, such as "We are now directors;" the implication being that to operationalize the intended purpose one needed only to review a new manila envelope of mimeographed sheets. From watching the reactions of the various group members it seems appropriate to question this practice. A high repetition of verbal messages, stereotypic comments, and the absence of a behavioral acknowledgement of role change were all observed.

In order to change these outcomes, it seems appropriate to suggest the use of environmental props and strategies to effectively alert participants to a different context. These might be as follows:

a. going out of room and re-entering
b. switching seats
c. rearranging tables and chairs
d. using multicolorcoded mimeograph materials
e. using name plates
f. presenting newsprint on easel with black crayon messages
g. including environmental props, such as cribs, high chairs, baby bottles, etc.

It is alternatively suggested that the simulation consist of one, or at most, two settings. The staff meeting seemed to be the setting most conducive to role play, followed by the advisory board. The directors meeting should probably only be used with participants who are very experienced in the field and in role play.

In the case of participants who have not previously role-played, it would be worthwhile to stage a mock role-play situation in front of the whole group before breaking up into small groups, or perhaps present a short videotaped modeling session. Alternatively, the model could be one trained participant (perhaps the facilitator) who role-plays the director and describes the center to participants, as if she were describing it to a community group.

Usefulness of the simulation for other audiences. The simulation project clearly has value for facilitating communication among students, faculty, and practitioners. In fact, additional time during subsequent simulations might draw specific attention to the experience of practitioners and the expertise of faculty members and students and the particular contribution of each perspective to both the developmental or content issues and the decision making process.

This simulation has potential for enhancing awareness of significant issues and developing communication channels between the researcher-academicians, practitioners, and community people who may be influential in supporting not only relevant research but development and expansion of quality infant care programs. These people might be legislators, social service staff who assist parents in making child care decisions, parents with need of daycare for infants, funding agencies etc. The simulation is a means of presenting relevant issues, alternatives, and concerns from many perspectives without necessarily dictating courses of action. It can serve to involve participants in making informed decisions on the administrative level about infant daycare. The technique may prove to be extremely valuable in initiating discussions on the highly controversial questions of whether infants should be placed in group

centers or family daycare homes. And it may serve a much needed role in training of workers at all levels of child care, a rapidly expanding field.

CAF:8

References

Anderson, D. P. In-basket techniques. In D. L. Bolton (Ed.), The use of simulation in education administration. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1971.

Cohen, D. J. Day care: Serving preschool children. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Office of Child Development, 1970.

Cruickshank, D. R. Simulation: New directions in teacher preparation. Phi Delta Kappan, 48, 1966, 23-24.

Cunningham, L. L. A powerful but underdeveloped educational tool. In D. L. Bolton (Ed), The use of simulation in educational administration. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1971.

White House Conference on Children. Profiles of Children. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1970.

APPENDIX A

Background Materials for the Simulation

I. Center description

II. Roster of children

III. Staff meeting agenda

Appendix A

I. Center Description

Sunnyside Daycare Center

The infant daycare center has been licensed for a capacity of 50 infants. There are six large rooms, a kitchen and a long narrow vestibule. Each of two rooms share a bathroom with one toilet and two sinks.

The infant center is run in cooperation relationship between the city college and school district. Students in the college and high schools are given priority for spaces in the center. The services of a school nurse are provided two mornings per week. The director is recently graduated from a master's level program in early childhood development. There are two full-time bachelor's degree persons with child care credentials, six aides recruited from the community who work full time and eight students from the community college who work part time (none more than 20 hours per week). In addition, students from the college and high school who study child development, small business mangement, nursing, and education use the infant center as a field placement or observation opportunity. The usual ratio is four to one.

This year there is a new director, one new full-time teacher, and as happens each year, a new group of students' parents. The aides have been at the center from 12 to 30 months.

The funding comes from the community college with the school district contributing 25% of the operating budget in addition to the 8 hours of nursing time. Policy decisions are made by a committee composed of representatives from the community college, the school district, the center director, a teacher, and parents who volunteer for the position.

Meetings are open to people with specific issues who may place issues on the agenda.

The catchment area reflects a heterogeneous multicultural population with the following percentages: 47% Spanish-surnamed, 20.7% Anglo, 146% Asian-American, 6.1% Black American, .6% American Indian, 1.2% other.

The community college students range in age from 17 to 72. The median age is 23. Slightly over half of the students are between 17 and 24 years of age. The high school students range from 14 to 17 years.

Half of the infants are children of college students; the other half are primarily children of teen-aged parents attending the nearby high schools. When there are openings, some infants are brought to the center by working mothers who live near the center. Currently there are 48 infants.

The center is open from 7 a.m. to 6 p.m. The children's ages range from a few weeks of age to 20 months. Children are grouped by age with "walkers" separated from "non-walkers." There is one crib for each infant and every room has a rocking chair, two large playpens, a mat, some stacking plastic armchairs, a diaper changing counter and high chairs. Mothers of young infants are required to bring the current, popular plastic infant seats with their child each day. They also bring their child's milk and food.

The center is adjacent to the preschool day care facility. The preschool group has agreed to give the infant center a part of their playground 9' by 12' in size. The preschool center takes children aged 2½ to 5½ years.

Appendix A (Continued)

II. Roster of children

Name	Age	Name	Age
Sandra Lesser	6 months	Imelda Mayfield	12 months
Maria Rodriguez	3 weeks	Mary Son Loo	18 months
Michael Marsin	16 months	Barbara McClintock	2 weeks
Thomas Chen	6 weeks	Sara Menendez	2 weeks
Miguel Hernandez	12 weeks	Frank Ferris	10 months
Kathy Torres	12 months	Andrew Chan	16 months
Millicent Jones	6 weeks	Rosa Nayarit	11 months
Carol Garcia	10 months	William Adler	3 weeks
Flora Garcia	2 months	Dorothy Hsu	2 months
Susan Ping	9 months	Timmy Browne	6 months
Pepe Martinez	12 months	Jerry Lim	9 months
Sean Harregan	16 months	Frances Marzita	11 months
Joseph Flores	9 months	Shari Vickman	13 months
Rhonda Heath	8 months	Anthony Wo Dick	13 months
Michael Marquesa	16 months	Deidre Wesley	15 months
Maxine Paulsen	6 weeks	Howard Lewis	14 months
Laurie Gonzales	4 months	Charo Gutierrez	6 weeks
Mara Vasquez	2 months	Alicia Sanchez	12 months
Lillian Chacon	7 months	Jean Analta	2 weeks
Margaret Olmstead	9 months	David Lang	4 months
Lisa Tong	8 months	Jessica Richards	9 months
Anne Johnson	6 months	Sandra Holt	17 months
Vincent Mendez	7 months	Frank Jing	11 months
Steven Hueng	6 weeks	Benjamin Kondo	6 weeks

Appendix A (Continued)

1C

III. Staff Meeting Agenda

TO: Staff Members

FROM: Arlene

RE: Staff Meetings, November 18

The meeting will be held in Room 30} Moore Hall, from 1 p.m. until about 3:30. (It will be followed by a Governing Board Meeting.)

AGENDA

1. Old business
2. Staff and parent problems and complaints (see attached starred memos)
3. Cross age grouping in the center
4. Drop-in care. What should be the minimum and maximum hours of care for each child per week?
5. Expansion--should we expand to evening care? Family daycare?
6. Parent Involvement
7. Provisions for and identification of sick infants

Appendix B

In-Box Materials

I. Memos and letters for Content Issues of Attachment, separation, parent-infant, caretaker-infant interaction

II. Curriculum (Procedures and materials)

III. Teacher training

IV. Health Services

V. Multicultural concerns

VI Expansion alternatives

Appendix B

I. Memo about parents

Telephone Message

DATE: June 23, 1975

RE: Johnny Cole--age 8 months (new applicant)

Mrs. Cole has requested that a different staff member attend to her infant each day, as she does not want her child to become attached to any one individual.

Telephone Message

DATE: June 23, 1975

RE: Timmy Brown--age 6 months

Mrs. Brown called to express her concern about having placed Timmy in the Center. In her Developmental Psychology class, John Bowlby was quoted as stressing the crucial importance of the biological mother in infant care.

Telephone Message

DATE: June 24, 1975

RE: Brad Jenkins--age 14 months

Mrs. Jenkins wants to know if it is all right for Brad to bring his favorite blanket to the Center.

Appendix B (Continued)

Attachment and Daycare Issues.

PARENTS WITHOUT PARTNERS
Lindavista Division
210 South Grenoble Street
Southside, California 91630

October 29, 1975

Ms. Arlene Welles
Director, Sunnyside Infant
Day Care Center
3309 East 14th Street
Los Angeles, CA 90006

Dear Arlene:

I know that you need no reminder that you are addressing our group at our monthly luncheon meeting on December 17 on the pros and cons of infant day care; but, I thought that I should warn you that our previous speaker, Dr. Johannes Berkman, presented some of Spitz' old films on the detrimental effects of institutionalization on infants. You should be prepared to respond to any questions that may stem from that presentation.

I am looking forward to hearing your presentation, and I am confident that you will have no difficulty in handling any of the issues that might arise.

Sincerely,

Joan Matthews

Joan Matthews
Program Director
Lindavista Division
PWOP

L8t

Appendix B (Continued)

II. Curriculum Programs

First Day of School

Dear Parents,

The staff would like to notify you of a new direction in our curriculum this year. Since the age span covered at our center is primarily a period of motor development, the curriculum this year will emphisize that area. Piaget, the well known Swiss child psychologist, even labels this period from birth to two the "sensory motor stage". The children then, will be given opportunities throughout the day for exercise. Fine motor activities as well as gross motor activities will be stressed. Teachers will work with the students on a one to one basis at least once a day to promote crawling, walking, rolling, and general strength and coordination. We will be glad to give parents copies of exercises being done with their child to carry on at home. We hope you will notice and be pleased with the motor progress your child makes. Also feel free to ask questions or comment on this curricular inovation.

Sincerely,

the Staff

Arlene: Is this OK to circulate to parents?

Appendix B (Continued)
II. Curriculum Materials

Better Baby Products
101 State Street
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80903

June 18, 1975

Ms. Arlene Welles
Director, Sunnyside Infant
Day Care Center
3309 East 14th Street
Los Angeles, California 90006

Dear Ms. Welles:

This letter is to introduce you to our Los Angeles Sales Representative, Mr. Gaylord Panser. He is presently demonstrating one of our recent innovations, the baby bottle holder, which will make it possible to utilize your staff more effectively during feeding times. Mr. Panser will be contacting you shortly and, at that time, he can more fully inform you about the effectiveness of this new feeding device and answer any questions you may have about it.

We hope to be helpful to you in your capacity as Director of the Sunnyside Infant Day Care Center. Please do not hesitate to contact us if we can be of service in any way.

Respectfully yours,

Thomas Foolery

Thomas Foolery
President
Better Baby Products

TF/ajb

Attachment B (Continued)

II. Curriculum Materials

MEMO:

To: Teachers

From: Program Director

The following is a list of toys that were packed away from the previous years. Please advise as to which classroom they belong in- infant, toddler, both or neither, (discard).

tonka toy trucks
busy boards
soft cloth balls
shape boxes
large wagons
mobiles
rattles
pacifiers
hard balls (rubber)
jolly jumpers
stuffed animals
large pegboards
tops
music boxes (some with figurines)
roller skates
toy baby buggy
bean bags
bag of marbles
balloons
assorted dolls
wind up swings
walkers

Appendix B (Continued)

III. Teacher Training

Interoffice Memo

TO: Principal (Name)

From: Board Member (Name)

As you know we are currently looking for a lead teacher for our toddler group. Our most promising applicant so far, Marilyn Miller, insists that it will not be necessary for her to participate in our teacher training program which is considered mandatory for every newly hired teacher. I am tempted to agree with her as the program where she is currently working as a team teacher for an infant group seems to closely parallel our own curriculum: also, she worked here as an aide in the toddler group two years ago.

I would appreciate your opinion concerning this situation.

Appendix B (Continued)

III. Teacher Training

INTER-STAFF MEMO

Sunnyside Infant Day Care Center

TO: Arlene FROM: Teaching Staff

DATE:. June 24, 1975

RE: Group Meeting for New Parents, July 2

We have just learned that you will be out of town for this parent meeting. Please brief us on the kind of issues you think will come up and give us some guidelines as to how we should handle them, particularly as they pertain to separation reactions on the part of the parent as well as the child.

Appendix B (Continued)

IV. Health Services

TO: Arlene

FROM: March

We need guidelines about sick children.

How shall we decide?

Is there any place for them here at the center?

I'm concerned about keeping really sick infants in with the others.

INTER-STAFF MEMO

Sunnyside Infant Day Care Center

TO: Arlene Welles FROM: Marcy

DATE: June 23, 1975

RE: Sandra Lesser -- age 6 months (new enrollee)

Sandra has a previous history of eating difficulties and appears very undernourished. She continues to have eating problems here. As the Staff Conference on her is still two weeks away, I would appreciate any recommendations from you now as to how we might proceed.

V. Multicultural Concerns

405 Hilgard Avenue
Los Angeles, Calif. 90024
Tel: 825-1032

Graduate Students' Association
in Education, UCLA

Lawrence Estrada,
President

Dear Sir:

A group of concerned parents would like to meet with you at your next official meeting in order to present a number of issues that have been brought to our attention. Please include our request on your agenda.

The issues of concern are as follow:

1. The lack of involvement of all representatives of the minority groups on the advisory board.

2. The lack of staff which would reflect the ethnic composition of the students.

3. The attempts by some members of the staff to superimpose their values on our children.

We feel that the hiring practices of the center could be more responsive to our needs if they carefully examined the attitudes of those people hired to attend to our children.

Sincerely,

Carlos de la Vega

Carlos de la Vega

Appendix B (Continued)

VI. Expansion Alternatives

Peabody Junior College
33011 East 14th Street
Los Angeles, California 90006

June 20, 1975

Ms. Arlene Welles
Director, Sunnyside Infant
Day Care Center
3309 East 14th Street
Los Angeles, California 90006

Dear Ms. Welles:

As you know, funds have been made available for the expansion of the infant day care center; however, the Board would like some clarification as to how you think the funds should be used. More specifically, should we consider developing a family care unit, or would it be more advantageous to expand our facility in its present form? While the relative cost is of concern, we are primarily interested in the plan that would most adequately meet the needs of the population we serve. At our next Board Meeting, scheduled for July 30, we would like you to present a detailed proposal for this future development, as well as the rationale underlying it.

I hope that this request places no undue pressure upon you; however, I know that you, too, would like to expedite this matter.

Regards,

A Johnson

Alan Johnson
Chairman
Board of Directors
Peabody Junior College

AJ/ajb

Appendix C

INFANT SIMULATION EVALUATION*

I Participant Information

I.1. Are you a:

_____ Student
_____ Staff member of a facility
_____ Faculty member
_____ Other. Please specify: _____

I.2. Do you have direct contact with an infant facility or center?

_____ Yes
_____ No

I.3. Are you:

_____ Male
_____ Female

1.4. Which small group simulation did you participate in?

_____ 1
_____ 2
_____ 3
_____ 4
_____ 5

II The Simulation

II.1. Before you came to the simulation, in what way did you expect to participate? (Check all those that apply.)

_____ Listen to a large group lecture.
_____ Participate in a highly formalized, highly structure small group situation.
_____ Participate in a very open-ended, unstructured small group situation.
_____ Other (Please tell us how you expected to participate).

_____

II.2. Were your expectations met?

_____ Yes, my expectations were met.
_____ My expectations were met to some extent.
_____ My expectations were not met.

Appendix C (Continued)

II.3. Of the simulation forms used, rank them in order of interest to you.

_____ All participants role-played directors.
_____ Staff meeting simulation.
_____ Advisory board simulation.

II.4. How would you describe your small simulation groups? (Check all those that apply)

_____ I felt comfortable in the group.
_____ Everyone was actively involved.
_____ Only a few people participated.
_____ I felt hesitant in entering the discussion.

II.5. Did you have a chance to raise all the issues and concerns you had in your small group?

_____ Yes
_____ No

II.6. Do you feel that this type of simulation effort would be valuable to other students, parents and people involved in child care?

_____ No
_____ Probably not
_____ I am uncertain
_____ Probably yes
_____ Definitely yes

II.7. Do you have any suggestions for changes in format, topics, or organization which you would like to see implemented in a fugure simulation?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

*This evaluation form is based upon one presented in Takanishi, R. and Chaille, C., Garduque, L., Lovaas, B., and Pletcher, G. G. In ASUCLA Child Care Center Workshop Evaluation and documentation report. Report #1, July, 1974, Appendix 3.